

# Technical Subcommittee

May 25, 2006

# Contracts 1 - 3

- Covering of Materials
  - Want coarser materials taken to the dewatering facility, such as cobble and boulders, to also be covered to reduce volatilization.

# Habitat

- Overall
  - Plan is more engineering than habitat restoration driven
- Near Shore
  - What will be effects of shoreline stabilization on habitat?
  - How can one know habitat replacement needs with limited data near shore?
  - EPA intends to have more data collected near shore for Phase I and II in 06 summer.
- Modeling
  - Concern that too much of plan based on modeling and not field data
  - Field data provides more local, contextual, accurate information such as “depth plants grow in that part of river” and “soil composition in area X”

# Habitat

- **Oversight**
  - Changes in field should be decided by habitat specialist, not engineering field supervisor
  - Current plan allows project to alter habitat to deeper, river bottom habitats, which changes composition of habitat types
- **Replanting**
  - Current lists include invasive species
  - Recommendation for SAV (submerged aquatic vegetation) at up to 9 feet when 3 to 4 is likely maximum depth
  - After how many replantings is it considered a “failure.”  
When fail, what mitigation measures are required?

# Habitat

- **Monitoring**

- Expectation that monitoring will occur at least two years after success but no more than 20.
- Important to have longer monitoring time for habitat restoration since changes/success can only be measured over longer time frames.
- Some planned indicators, such as biomass of invasive species, may not be best